

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CHERYL LEE-OWENS
749 West Allens Lane

Philadelphia, PA 19119

Plaintiff

CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

v.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA 440 North Broad Street Philadelphia, PA 19130

Defendant

16 4648

CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff CHERYL LEE-OWENS, by and through her undersigned counsel, brings this civil action against Defendant SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA and avers the following:

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Plaintiff brings this action under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq., as amended, Americans with Disabilities Act Amendment Act of 2008 (ADAAA), and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act (PHRA), 43 P.S. 951-963, et seq.
 - 2. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to the following statutes:

A. 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which gives district courts original jurisdiction over civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States;

- B. 28 U.S.C. § 1343 (3) and (4), which gives district courts jurisdiction over actions to secure civil rights extended by the United States government; and
- C. 28 U.S.C. 1367, which gives district courts supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims.
- 3. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. 1391(B) inasmuch as the events giving rise to these claims occurred within this district.
- 4. Plaintiff received the 90 day Notice of Right to Sue from the Justice
 Department on June 3, 2016. (See Right to Sue letter attached hereto.)
 II. PARTIES
- Plaintiff is a citizen of the United States and resides in Philadelphia,
 Pennsylvania, which is in this judicial district.
- 6. Defendant is a publicly funded quasi-governmental agency duly constituted under state law to provide educational services for the children residing in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in accordance with federal and state law.
- 7. Defendant is also the recipient of federal funding which, in part, is conditioned upon Defendant's compliance with federal laws, including those laws prohibiting employment discrimination.
 - 8. Defendant employs in excess of 500 employees.

III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 9. All preceding allegations are incorporated herein as if set forth fully at length below.
 - 10. Plaintiff began her employment with Defendant as a teacher in 1987.

- 11. At all times relevant hereto, Maya Johnstone was Plaintiff's immediate supervisor at Wagner Middle School, which is located at 1701 Chelten Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 12. Plaintiff is a 1979 Honors graduate from Howard University located in Washington, D.C.
- 13. In 1982, Plaintiff graduated with Honors from Temple University receiving a Master's Degree in Special Education.
- 14. At the time of her forced retirement, Plaintiff was employed as a certified teacher with a Master's Degree plus 30 hours of additional academic training and her pay grade was Step 11, which was the highest level for salary credit. Her salary was \$83,381 annually.
- 15. At Wagner School, Plaintiff worked as an Educational Inclusion Specialist. In this capacity, Plaintiff was responsible for the implementation of the Inclusion Program in which she was responsible for integrating students with disabilities and students without disabilities in the same classroom setting.
- 16. In performing her duties, the physical demands were numerous.

 Plaintiff was required to go to classrooms, teach daily, stand, kneel, crouch, stoop and bend over students to provide individual instruction and apply skill development techniques to the student population that she served. Plaintiff was also required to carry heavy books, computers, printers and other equipment.
- 17. According to her medical history, Plaintiff suffers from fibromyalgia, rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, tendonitis, glaucoma, spinal stenosis,

advanced degenerative joint disease of the lumbar spine, and complete right rotator cuff tear.

- 18. Plaintiff is a qualified individual with a disability as defined in 42 U.S.C. § 12111(8).
- 19. As a result of her medical condition, Plaintiff was placed on extended sick leave in September, 2011.
- 20. Plaintiff returned to work in May, 2012 and completed working in the school year in June, 2012.
- 21. Plaintiff returned to work at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year in September, 2012 and went out on extended sick leave from January, 2013 until June, 2013.
- 22. On or about August 26, 2013, Plaintiff, in preparation for her return to work, contacted Ms. Maya Johnstone, the Principal at Wagner Middle School, to inquire about her room assignment.
- 23. Ms. Johnstone informed Plaintiff that she (Plaintiff) would be reassigned from her room on the second floor to a room on the third floor of the building.
- 24. Plaintiff informed Ms. Johnstone that the reassignment to the higher floor in the building, which has no elevators, was a problem due to Plaintiff's medical condition and prior medical leaves, which was well documented in her medical file at the school district.
- 25. Ms. Johnstone failed to engage initially an interactive process to determine what accommodation regarding room assignment would have been

possible to permit Plaintiff to return to work with a reasonable accommodation of no stairs, as was requested in Plaintiff's letter to Andrew Rosen dated August 27, 2013.

- 26. On or about August 28, 2013, Plaintiff went to Wagner School ready to return to work.
- 27. Upon inspecting her work area, Plaintiff found her belongings packed in boxes, bags and crates outside her former classroom on the second floor.
- 28. Upon discovering the items in the hallway, Plaintiff asked Johnstone where she (Plaintiff) would be moving at which time Plaintiff was advised that no decision on her room assignment had been made.
- 29. Plaintiff was informed by another colleague that she (Plaintiff) was being moved because Johnstone concluded that she would "probably go out anyway". Johnstone, by her conduct, was aware of Plaintiff's condition and created a barrier to Plaintiff's performance of her duties by intentionally forcing Plaintiff to climb stairs in light of Plaintiff's physical condition. Johnstone regarded Plaintiff as disabled in light of the classroom reassignment for Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's physical condition.
- 30. In a letter dated August 30, 2013, Plaintiff's treating physician indicated that Plaintiff needed an accommodation of no stair climbing due to her physical condition. This letter and her request for a reasonable accommodation pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act were sent by fax to Andrew Rosen, Deputy Employee Relations.

- 31. In an email dated Tuesday, September 3, 2013, Mr. Rosen informed Plaintiff that the District "does not consider or perceive you as disabled and you are required to perform all of your duties until your request is approved". Plaintiff understood these comments to mean that Defendant did not regard Plaintiff as disabled under the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 32. The actions of Johnstone and Rosen summarily prevented the initiation of the interactive process thereby constituting bad faith conduct since Plaintiff requested a simple, reasonable accommodation of a first floor room assignment to avoid climbing stairs as her doctors noted.
- 33. Rosen, acting on behalf of Defendant, never considered engaging in an interactive process to attempt to make a simple, reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff to return to work without a physical barrier to the performance of her duties, as is required by the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 34. Plaintiff was directed to report to Employee Health Services on September 4, 2013.
- 35. At Employee Health Services Plaintiff was seen by Dr. Jones, who is familiar with Plaintiff's medical history. Dr. Jones failed to engage in an interactive process with Plaintiff or Plaintiff's physician to develop a reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff to return to work.
- 36. Despite Defendant's awareness of Plaintiff's medical records and history, which include (1) x-rays of Plaintiff's lumbar spine taken in January, 2006 interpreted as showing discogenic degenerative changes, (2) an MRI of Plaintiff's sacroiliac joints done in January, 2006 showing a persistent defect involving the

lateral aspect of the lower sacrum on the left side, (3) x-rays of Plaintiff's lumbar spine taken in January, 2011 showing multilevel discogenic and degenerative changes, and (4) an MRI taken in September, 2011 showing disc degeneration of the lumbosacral spine with bulging canal stenosis and bilateral femoral stenosis at the L5/S1 level which were produced to Defendant in conjunction with Plaintiff's leave requests, Defendant refused to engage in an interactive process in good faith to develop a reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff.

- 37. Despite knowledge of Plaintiff's medical history, Dr. Jones, acting on behalf of Defendant, dismissively informed Plaintiff that spinal stenosis is not a disability and, in her "opinion", she sees it as a treatable illness.
- 38. The onset date of Plaintiff's disability was determined to have occurred on July 5, 2011, according to a ruling by the Social Security Administration dated April 29, 2014. However, Plaintiff was able to work with reasonable accommodation.
- 39. The ADA, ADAA and the implementing regulations make it unlawful for Defendant to fail to make a reasonable accommodation for an otherwise qualified person, such as Plaintiff, because of her known physical impairment which prevents her from climbing stairs in a building that has no elevators.
- 40. The ADA, the ADAA and the implementing regulations make it unlawful for Defendant to deny Plaintiff the opportunity for employment on the basis of the need for reasonable accommodation, such as a room assignment on the first floor of Wagner School or transfer to a school with an elevator.

- 41. Plaintiff has had a substantial record of physical impairment, all of which was known to Defendant.
- 42. Upon information and belief, there was no undue hardship imposed on the Defendant in the reassignment of Plaintiff to the first floor or to another school with elevators given her disability.
- 43. On September 5, 2013, Plaintiff, in support of her request for a reasonable accommodation, faxed another letter advising that Plaintiff should not be forced to climb stairs due to her condition to Rosen and Carol Kenney. This letter was from Plaintiff's physical therapist, Colene Claiborne, DPT. Dr. Claiborne is the Clinical Supervisor at Aqualab Physical Therapy.
- 44. Defendant never responded to any of Plaintiff's requests for a reasonable accommodation.
- 45. Plaintiff asked Johnstone about the status of the request for a reasonable accommodation. Johnstone told Plaintiff, "you are not a priority for anyone downtown". Plaintiff understood this comment to mean that the request for the reasonable accommodation was to be ignored and, in fact, was never acted upon by the Defendant. Plaintiff also understood these comments to mean that Defendant would not engage in the interactive process.
- 46. On September 23, 2013, Plaintiff was forced to go out of work permanently on sick leave due to the exacerbation of pain in her hands and arms from pulling herself up and down three flights of stairs every work day after she returned to work.

- 47. The forced stair climbing caused Plaintiff to develop carpal tunnel syndrome as a result of the constant grabbing of the stair rails to keep from falling due to her physical limitations.
- 48. Upon information and belief, Defendant knew or had reason to know that Plaintiff's physical condition would exacerbate due to Defendant's inaction regarding Plaintiff's request for the reasonable accommodation and/or Defendant's intentional failure to engage in the interactive process with Plaintiff to develop a reasonable accommodation.
- 49. Prior to Plaintiff's return to work Defendant assigned a younger woman to Plaintiff's former classroom on the second floor. Upon information and belief, this woman had no physical problems climbing stairs.
- 50. Upon information and belief, Johnstone's reassignment of Plaintiff to the third floor, coupled with Defendant's inaction in responding to Plaintiff's request for reasonable accommodation despite the doctors' reports, was calculated to aggravate Plaintiff's condition and force her out of her job.
- 51. The stairway was clearly a barrier to the efforts of Plaintiff to perform her duties in a building with no elevators.
- 52. Plaintiff, who had her rotator cuff surgically repaired prior to the room reassignment in 2013, reinjured the right rotator cuff after the reassignment and was diagnosed with a complete tear of the right rotator cuff. Defendant, or its employees or agents, caused Plaintiff to aggravate a preexisting condition.
- 53. On September 23, 2013, unable to continue to climb stairs, coupled with Defendant's intentional failure to engage in the interactive process to

develop a reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff, Plaintiff was forced to take sick leave and eventually constructively discharged through forced retirement because of her disability.

- 54. Plaintiff sent a status request regarding the payout to Andrew Rosen on October 14, 2013, and received no response even though Plaintiff retired on disability status on October 7, 2013.
- 55. On or about June 9, 2014, Plaintiff, after patiently waiting for a response from Rosen regarding her personal leave payout to which she was entitled, contacted Lincoln Investment to inquire about the status of the payout.
- 56. Plaintiff was informed that the School District defined her status as terminated which rendered her ineligible to receive the payout.
- 57. Upon information and belief, this characterization of Plaintiff's employment status was done to delay the payout and thus was in retaliation for complaining about Defendant's failure to provide the reasonable accommodation. Further, the mischaracterization delayed her payout payment.
- 58. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct and/or employees acting on behalf of Defendant, Plaintiff suffered humiliation, embarrassment, anxiety and mental anguish.
- 59. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's conduct as stated above, Plaintiff has lost income and benefits.
- 60. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendant, or its employees or agents acting on behalf of Defendant, Plaintiff has suffered further physical injury.

- 61. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendant, its employees or agents, Plaintiff lost professional stature and employment.
- 62. The complaints about Defendant's failure to make a reasonable accommodation in light of Plaintiff's disability, as well as her complaints about the conduct of Rosen, Johnstone and Dr. Jones, constituted protected activity which is protected by 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a) in light of <u>Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Ry. V. White</u>, 548 U.S. 53, 126 Sup. Ct. 2405 (2006).

A. FEDERAL CLAIMS

COUNT 1

Plaintiff v. Defendant School District

Violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act
as Amended, 42 U.S.C. § 12112(a)(1),
42 U.S.C. § 12112(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. 12112(a)(5)(A) and (B)

- 63. The preceding paragraphs alleged herein are incorporated and made a part hereof as if fully set forth below.
- 64. Plaintiff is a qualified individual who with a reasonable accommodation can perform the essential functions of the position that she held.
- 65. Defendant, through Johnstone, reassigned Plaintiff to a classroom that required Plaintiff to climb three flights of stairs in a school building with no elevators.
- 66. Defendant knew or had reason to know that Plaintiff's doctors stated in several reports that Plaintiff was not to engage in stair climbing as a result of her physical condition which qualified as a disability or physical impairment.

- 67. Johnstone, acting on behalf of Defendant, reassigned Plaintiff to a third floor classroom fully aware of the opinion of Plaintiff's doctors, as stated above.
- 68. Defendant failed to engage in an interactive process to create a reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff.
- 69. Defendant's failure to accommodate Plaintiff's limitations affected the terms and conditions and privileges of her employment.
- 70. Plaintiff was substantially limited in performing a major life activity in walking up and down stairs and was regarded as disabled by Johnstone.
 - 71. Defendant was aware of Plaintiff's substantial record of impairment.
- 72. Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of disability in denying her employment and by altering the terms and conditions of her employment such that Plaintiff was forced to retire due to the disability in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12101(a) and (b) and 42 U.S.C. § 12112(a).
- 73. Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff, a qualified individual, on the basis of disability by utilizing a method of administration, to wit, a classroom reassignment that required Plaintiff to walk up and down stairs in a building with no elevators without a reasonable accommodation thereby exacerbating her disability and forcing Plaintiff to retire in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as Amended.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully requested that this Honorable Court grant judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant and award monetary damages in excess of \$150,000 to Plaintiff for lost income, mental anguish, pain

13

and suffering, humiliation and embarrassment, and any other relief which the Court deems proper, plus attorney fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

COUNT II

Plaintiff v. Defendant School District of Philadelphia Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12112(b)(5)(A)

- 74. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully at length below.
- 75. Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of disability by not making reasonable accommodation to the known physical limitation of Plaintiff, an otherwise qualified individual with a disability who was an employee, by failing to engage in an interactive process to determine a reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff and thereby causing Plaintiff to be constructively discharged.
- 76. Defendant failed to demonstrate that an accommodation would impose an undue hardship on the operation of the Wagner School, or any other school in the Philadelphia School District.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully requested that this Honorable Court grant judgment against Defendant in an amount in excess of \$150,000 plus lost wages, lost future earnings, punitive damages, attorney fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988, cost and expenses.

COUNT III

Plaintiff v. Defendant
Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)

- 77. All preceding paragraphs alleged herein are incorporated and made a part hereof as if set forth at length below.
- 78. Defendant intentionally delayed the payout to which Plaintiff was entitled by falsely informing Lincoln Investment that Plaintiff was terminated.
- 79. Plaintiff was forced out of work and forced to retire due to disability even though Plaintiff could perform the work with a reasonable accommodation.
- 80. The Defendant knew or had reason to know that characterizing Plaintiff's separation as a termination would cause Plaintiff to be declared ineligible to receive the payout.
- 81. Upon information and belief, Defendant characterized Plaintiff's separation as a termination in retaliation for Plaintiff's complaint regarding Defendant's violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as Amended, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment in her favor and against Defendant School District in an amount in excess of \$150,000 plus lost wages, lost future earnings, pain and suffering, embarrassment, mental anguish, attorney fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988, costs, expenses, and any other relief which the Court deems just.

B. STATE LAW CLAIMS

COUNT IV

Plaintiff v. School District of Philadelphia
Violation of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act
43 P.S. § 951-963 ("The Act")

- 82. All preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein as if fully set forth at length below.
- 83. Defendant engaged in conduct which violated Section 5(a)(5) of The Act in that because of Plaintiff's disability Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff by altering the terms and conditions of her employment through constructive discharge because of her disability.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant for monetary damages in an amount in excess of \$150,000 plus attorney fees, costs and expenses.

COUNT V

Plaintiff v. School District of Philadelphia
Violation of 43 P.S. § 951, Section 5(d)
Retaliation

- 84. All preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein as if fully set forth below at length.
- 85. Defendant engaged in conduct which was in retaliation for rights secured to her by Section 5(d) of The Act,

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment in the amount of monetary damages in excess of \$150,000 plus attorney fees, costs and expenses.

ISAAC H. GREEN, ESQUIRE DEAN F. OWENS, ESQUIRE

Attorneys for Plaintiff Cheryl Lee-Owens



CERTIFIED MAIL 70100290000020173293 U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE WITHIN 90 DAYS

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Karen Ferguson , EMP, PHB, Room 4701 Washington, DC 20530

June 03, 2016

Cheryl Lee-Owens c/o Isaac H. Green, Esquire Isaac H. Green, Attorney at Law 200 Limekiln Pike Glenside, PA 19038

Re: EEOC Charge Against The School District of Philadelphia

No. 530201402879

Dear Lee-Owens:

Because you filed the above charge with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and more than 180 days have elapsed since the date the Commission assumed jurisdiction over the charge, and no suit based thereon has been filed by this Department, and because you through your attorney have specifically requested this Notice, you are hereby notified that you have the right to institute a civil action against the above-named respondent under: Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. 12111, et seq., and, Title V, Section 503 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 12203.

If you choose to commence a civil action, such suit must be filed in the appropriate Court within 90 days of your receipt of this Notice.

The investigative file pertaining to your case is located in the EEOC Philadelphia District Office, Philadelphia, PA.

This Notice should not be taken to mean that the Department of Justice has made a judgment as to whether or not your case is meritorious.

Sincerely,

Vanita Gupta

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

Civil Rights Division

bv

Karen L. Ferguson

Supervisory Civil Rights Analyst Employment Litigation Section

cc: Philadelphia District Office, EEOC The School District of Philadelphia

Case 21660204648-JHS Document 1 Filed 08/26/16 Flags 15 19 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the info provided by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS		
. ()				DEFENDANTS		
Lee-Owens, C	heryl	/) :	School Distr	ict of Philade	1phia /
(b) County of Residence of	• /	niladelphia		County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	Philadelphia /
•		SES)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES O	ONLY)
	1			NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	NDEMNATION CASES, USE T OF LAND INVOLVED	HE LOCATION OF
()						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Isaac H. Gre	Address, Email and Telephone. An Feauire	Vumber)		Attorneys (If Known)		
200 Limekiln	Pike, Glensi	le. PA 19038				
267-625-9189		ic, 17, 13000	}			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
[] 1 U.S. Government				For Diversity Cases Only) PT		and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	U.S. Government	Not a Party)	Citize	n of This State		
1	/				of Business In 7	This State
2 U.S. Government	4 Diversity		Citize	n of Another State		
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenshi	ip of Parties in Item III)			of Business In A	Another State
				n or Subject of a cign Country	3 O 3 Foreign Nation	0 6 0 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box On	ılv)	1'01	cigii Country		
CONTRACT		RTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury -	0 625	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC
O 130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product	Product Liability	O 690	O Other	28 USC 157	3729(a))
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	O 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical	- 1		PROPERTY RIGHTS	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act		Personal Injury	1	,	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal			O 840 Trademark	☐ 460 Deportation
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	340 Marine 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability		LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Linbility	PERSONAL PROPER	TY 0 710	0 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	☐ 480 Consumer Credit
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending	G 72	Act 0 Labor/Management	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	O 380 Other Personal Property Damage	74	Relations O Railway Labor Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	☐ 385 Property Damage		I Family and Medical	(Agycor) 1231 con	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	D 79	Leave Act O Other Labor Litigation		☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION		l Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Act 896 Arbitration
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act	0 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	442 Employment 443 Housing/	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence			☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	☐ 530 General			20 030 7007	 950 Constitutionality of
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	448 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	Other:	O 46	IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application		State Statutes
	U 446 Amer, w/Disabilities - Other	☐ 540 Mandamus & Othe ☐ 550 Civil Rights	г 🗆 46	5 Other Immigration Actions		
_	448 Education	O 555 Prison Condition	1	Actions		
\wedge		Cl 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of				
/		Confinement				
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	••					• .
		Remanded from Appellate Court	J 4 Reins Reop		rred from	
\bigcup	11 42 HSC 9 1	dute under which you are 2101 et seq.	e filing (D	o not cite jurisdictional state	utes unless diversity);	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	DN Brief description of ca	nise.			1	
TAX DESCRIPTION IN			ities	Act violati	ONS CHECK YES and	if demanded in complaint:
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.		emands 150,000	JURY DEMAND	/ \ i
VIII. RELATED CASE	C(S) (See instructions):					
IF ANY	(ace mairacnons):	JUDGE /		_A_	DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 24	ANTI	SIGNATURE OF ATT	ORNEY O	FRECORD	ann 1	AUG 26 2016
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	7016	V mi	m/		7 0	700 EU 2010
/	4OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE

APPENDIX I

CIVIL ACTION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

v.		:	16	46	4	8
SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHIL	ADELPHIA	:	NO.			
In accordance with the Civil plaintiff shall complete a cas filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the edesignation, that defendant si the plaintiff and all other par which that defendant believe	e Management Tree a copy on all defe vent that a defendable, with its first a ties, a case manage	ack Designat ndants. (See lant does not appearance, s ement track	tion Form in all civil cases § 1:03 of the plan set forth t agree with the plaintiff to submit to the clerk of cour	s at the time of the reverse regarding saint and serve of	of se id on	
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	DLLOWING CAS	E MANAG	EMENT TRACKS:			
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases b	orought under 28 (J.S.C. §2241	through §2255.	()	
(b) Social Security – Cases r and Human Services deny	_			h ()	
(c) Arbitration – Cases requir	red to be designate	ed for arbitra	tion under Local Civil Ru	le 53.2. ()	
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvin exposure to asbestos.	ng claims for pers	onal injury o	r property damage from	()	
(e) Special Management – Ca commonly referred to as of the court. (See reverse sid management cases.)	complex and that r le of this form for	need special of a detailed ex	or intense management by eplanation of special	, E	<u>,</u>	
(f) Standard Management - C	Isaac H. Cheen	Dueen		(X	Y	
Date I	Attorney-at-l		Attorney for P			
267-625-9189 Telephone	215-885-1166 FAX Number		eileensbiz@yahoo. E-Mail Address			

CHERYL LEE-LOWENS

APPENDIX

Address of Defendant: 440 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, PA 19130 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 09-23-2013 Philadelphia, PA (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongoverunnestal curporate party with any parent corporation and any publicity held corporation owning 10% occasion (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Poes this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge Date Terminated: Civil cases are deemed related when yea is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered sult pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yea No No 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior sult pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yea No 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yea No CIVIL: (Place V in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Case: 1. Indemnity Centract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. Patent 5. Diversity Austaction Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antituss 5. Patent S. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 8. Products Liability — Abecatos 9. All other Diversity Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Altorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Attenty-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not relately to any case now pendigg or within one year previously terminated action in this c	West Allens Lane, Philadelphia, PA 19119 16 4	. 101HULL.		ess of Plaintiff:_	dress of Pla
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and sany publicly held corporation owning 10% oct. por (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))					
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% octoor (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Yes		cident, Incident or Transaction: 09-	nt, Incident or	of Accident, Inc	ice of Accid
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Yes					
Civil cases are deemed related when yea is answered to any of the following questions: Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered sult pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No No Yes No No No Yes No No No No No No No N	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No	litigation possibilities?				
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously termin action in this court? 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No No No CIVIL. (Place in the court of terminated action in this court? Yes No No No No CIVIL (Place in the court of terminated action in this court? Yes No	Judge Date Terminated:	er:Judge		Number:	e Number:
Yes No No No No No No	n yes is answered to any of the following questions:	re deemed related when yes is answered to	leemed related	cases are deemed	il cases are
action in this court? Yes No	Yes□ No□				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previor terminated action in this court? Yes No	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_			
terminated action in this court? Yes No No CIVIL: (Place in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antifrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases 0. Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Ca	,				
Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:					
Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:	Yes LI NoLI	d action in this court?	tion in this co	minated action in	erminated a
2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 0. Social Security Review Cases 1. All other Pederal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (All other Diversity Review of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. ARE: Management Relations ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (Check appropriate Category) (Check appropriate Category) (All other Diversity Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (All other Diversity Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (All other Diversity Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (All other Diversity Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (All other Diversity Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (All other Diversity Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (All other Diversity Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (All other Diversity Cases (Please specify)				•	•
3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases 0. Social Securities Act(s) Cases 0. Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) (Check appropriate C	Contract, and All Other Contracts	mnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All	ty Contract, M	Indemnity Cor	☐ Indemn
4. Antitrust 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Clabor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Sivil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. Social Securities Act(a) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 1. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge. Attorney-at-Law Attorney-at-	2. Airplane Personal Injury	A		FELA	□ FELA
5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases 1. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. ATE: At trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	3. Assault, Defamation	s Act-Personal Injury	ct-Personal Inj	Jones Act-Pers	☐ Jones A
Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Civil Rights Civil Rights Products Liability Products Liability Asbestos Products Liability Asbestos Products Liability Asbestos All other Diversity Cases Please specify All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Counsel of record do hereby certify: ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acceptable of the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. Attorney-at-Law 36059 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.		must	:	Antitrust	☐ Antitrus
Total Rights 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases 1. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge. Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	•	at		Patent	☐ Patent
8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases 1. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge. Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial dc novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.		-	-	_	
Securities Act(s) Cases O. Social Security Review Cases I. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acknowledge and belief other than monetary damages is sought. ATE: Atrial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this civil acknowledge.	•	Rights	jhts	Civil Rights	Givil Ri
O. Social Security Review Cases O. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil accept the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. ATE: Atrial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this civil accepts that the compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	•	as Corpus	Corpus	Habeas Corpus	Habeas
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. ATE: NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not relates to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this				•	
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil acceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. ATE: NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this		-	-		_
Isaac H. Green (Check appropriate Category) Counsel of record do hereby certify:	Cases		-		
Relief other than monetary damages is sought. ATE: Atrial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this	(Check appropriate Category)	c H. Green	H. Green	aac H. G	Isaac
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this	usive of interest and costs;	m of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and	£\$150,000.00	the sum of \$150	ed the sum o
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.		gust 24,2016	ther than mon	1. 1	ß.
	Attorney at Jaw Attorney ID#	•		./	./
recept as noted above.		NOTE: A trial de novo w	NOTI		
ATE: Alemant It 1016 Sant Trees 36059 AUG	trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	to my knowledge, the within case is not r	ny knowledge	y that, to my kno	